



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,898	08/15/2005	Ian Carr	2040/109	2388
2101 7590 11/18/2008 BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP 125 SUMMER STREET BOSTON, MA 02110-1618				
EXAMINER				
RIES, LAURIE ANNE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/18/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/516,898

**Applicant(s)**

CARR ET AL.

**Examiner**

LAURIE RIES

**Art Unit**

2176

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 36-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 36-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/23/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 4 September 2008, and IDS, filed 23 September 2008, to the Original Application, filed 15 August 2005.
2. Claims 1-33 and 36-38 are pending. Applicant has cancelled claims 34-35. Claims 1, 14, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 36-38 are independent claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13, 29-30, 32, 36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrling (U.S. Publication 2005/0097008 A1).

**As per independent claim 1**, Ehrling discloses an apparatus for automatically building an electronic form for presentation to a user during a data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraph 0063, describing a dynamic composition engine including managers

that organize components in an electronic page or form) including a means for receiving as input a specification of data elements required during data capture, each data element having a type specification, and a logical relationship relative to other data elements in a hierarchical structure (See Ehring, paragraphs 0127-0130, describing receiving as input a specification of data elements in the form of application rules that are interpreted throughout all subsequent steps of the process by the appropriate managers, and a logical relationship relative to other data elements, in that the managers determine the next page or data element to be displayed based upon the particular application rules being interpreted).

Ehring also discloses a means for generating, from the input, a data capture definition file providing the specification of data elements and the hierarchical structure in a predetermined format (See Ehring, paragraphs 0130-0132, describing rendering data elements from a data capture definition file, such as a template, in a predetermined format).

Ehring also discloses a means for receiving the data capture definition file and automatically generating a plurality of visual displays for presentation to a user during execution of a data capture process, each visual display having an automatically determined form layout (See Ehring, paragraphs 0130-0132, describing rendering a number of visual displays for presentation to a user during execution of a data capture process) comprising a plurality of user input areas corresponding to the data elements (See Ehring, paragraphs 0063 and 0189, describing fields within an online application form), in which the form layout and physical positioning of the user input areas on each

display are determined, during runtime of the data capture process from information in the data capture definition file, in a manner corresponding to the defined logical hierarchical structure (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0061-0063, describing positioning and rendering data, such as user input areas on the form described in Ehrling paragraph 0189, during runtime of the data capture process from the data definition file).

**As per dependent claim 2**, Ehrling discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ehrling also discloses that the means for generating generates the data capture definition file in XML format (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0060-0061).

**As per dependent claim 4**, Ehrling discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ehrling also discloses that the data capture definition file further includes a functional specification of rule-based actions to be taken during execution of the data capture process, the means for receiving further including means for executing the rule-based actions during the data capture process, and determining successive visual displays for presentation to the user during the data capture process according to values of data captured and the rule-based actions applicable thereto (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0066-0067).

**As per dependent claim 5**, Ehrling discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ehrling also discloses that the means for generating the data capture definition file further includes means for incorporating a functional specification of a data model defining the bindings of data elements with an output message format (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0177-0178).

**As per dependent claim 6**, Ehrling discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ehrling also discloses that the means for generating the data capture definition file further includes means for incorporating a functional specification of data exchange requirements according to a form definition standard (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0043 and 0061).

**As per dependent claim 7**, Ehrling discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ehrling also discloses the means for generating the data capture definition file further includes means for enabling automatic building of portions of the data capture definition file according to a form definition standard (See Ehrling, paragraph 0018).

**As per dependent claim 8**, Ehrling discloses the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Ehrling also discloses that the means for generating the data capture definition file further includes means for incorporating the rule-based actions to be performed during execution of the data capture process, by a rule builder interface that enables rule actions and conditions to be assigned to data capture events (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0063-0066).

**As per dependent claim 9**, Ehrling discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ehrling also discloses that the means for generating further includes binding interface means for incorporating binding definitions into the data capture definition file, each binding definition defining the binding of a data element to a defined external data model (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0134-0135).

**As per dependent claim 10**, Ehring discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ehring also discloses a means for ensuring that the specification of data elements complies with a form definition standard (See Ehring, paragraphs 0043 and 0061).

**As per dependent claim 11**, Ehring discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ehring also discloses a means for executing a data capture process, comprising a means for receiving a data capture definition file (See Ehring, Figure 8, element 1010, and paragraph 0127) and a means for generation a succession of visual displays for presentation to a user, the physical layout of the visual displays being determined during execution of the data capture process, according to the defined data elements and their hierarchical structure in the data capture definition file, and according to process and display conditions prevailing in the platform executing the data capture process (See Ehring, paragraphs 0127-0130).

**As per dependent claim 13**, Ehring discloses the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Ehring also discloses that the means for executing the data capture process further includes means for executing rule-based actions according to a functional specification of rule-based actions defined in the data capture definition file (See Ehring, paragraphs 0066-0067).

**As per independent claim 29**, Ehring discloses an apparatus for generating an electronic form for presentation to a user during a data capture process (See Ehring, paragraph 0063, describing a dynamic composition engine including managers that organize components in an electronic page or form). Independent claim 29 additionally

incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of independent claim 1 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 1.

**As per independent claim 30**, Ehrling discloses a method of automatically building an electronic form for presentation to a user during a data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraph 0063, describing a dynamic composition engine including managers that organize components in an electronic page or form). Independent claim 30 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of independent claim 1 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 1.

**As per independent claim 32**, Ehrling discloses a method of automatically building an electronic form for presentation to a user during a data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraph 0063, describing a dynamic composition engine including managers that organize components in an electronic page or form). Independent claim 32 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of independent claim 1 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 1.

**As per independent claim 36**, Ehrling discloses an apparatus for automatically building an electronic form for presentation to a user during a data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraph 0063, describing a dynamic composition engine including managers that organize components in an electronic page or form). Independent claim 36 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of independent



claim 1 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 1.

**As per independent claim 38**, Ehrling discloses an apparatus for generating an electronic form for presentation to a user during a data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraph 0063, describing a dynamic composition engine including managers that organize components in an electronic page or form). Independent claim 38 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of independent claim 1 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 12, 14-20, 25-28, 31, 33, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrling (U.S. Publication 2005/0097008 A1), as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent 5,774,887).

**As per dependent claim 3**, Ehring teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ehring does not teach expressly including a functional specification of data validation operations to be performed in respect of at least some of the data elements during execution of the data capture process, the means for receiving further including means for executing the data validation operations during the data capture process. Wolff teaches a functional specification of data validation operations to be performed in respect of at least some of the data elements during execution of the data capture process and means for executing the data validation operations during the data capture process (See Wolff, Figure 4, showing various checks on data completion, such as element 220 and 222, and Column 6, lines 28-38, describing an indication of an invalid data entry). Ehring and Wolff are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic forms. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data validation specification and execution of data validation of Wolff with the data capture process and functional specification of Ehring. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wolff with Ehring for the benefit of ensuring that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

**As per dependent claim 12**, Ehring teaches the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Ehring does not teach expressly including a means for executing data

validation operations according to a functional specification of data validation operations defined in the data capture definition file. Wolff teaches a functional specification of data validation operations to be performed in respect of at least some of the data elements during execution of the data capture process and means for executing the data validation operations during the data capture process (See Wolff, Figure 4, showing various checks on data completion, such as element 220 and 222, and Column 6, lines 28-38, describing an indication of an invalid data entry). Ehrling and Wolff are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic forms. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data validation specification and execution of data validation of Wolff with the data capture process and functional specification of Ehrling. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wolff with Ehrling for the benefit of ensuring that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

**As per independent claim 14**, Ehrling teaches an for generating a data capture definition file for defining data elements required from a user during a data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraph 0063, describing a dynamic composition engine including managers that organize components in an electronic page or form) including a means for receiving as input a specification of data elements required during data

capture, each data element having a type specification, and a logical relationship relative to other data elements in a hierarchical structure (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0127-0130, describing receiving as input a specification of data elements in the form of application rules that are interpreted throughout all subsequent steps of the process by the appropriate managers, and a logical relationship relative to other data elements, in that the managers determine the next page or data element to be displayed based upon the particular application rules being interpreted).

Ehrling also discloses the type specifications and the hierarchical structure being usable for automatically determining a physical layout of visual displays for presentation to a user during a subsequent data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0130-0132, describing rendering data elements from a data capture definition file, such as a template, in a predetermined format).

Ehrling also discloses a means for associating, with the data elements, a set of rules for execution during a subsequent data capture process, for further enabling automatic determination of a physical layout of the visual displays to be presented to a user during the subsequent data capture process based on values of data captured during the data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraphs 0061-0066, describing determining the layout of data elements based on user input).

Ehrling also discloses a means for generating the data capture definition file providing the specification of data elements, the hierarchical structure, the data validation requirements and the set of rules in a predetermined format for subsequent execution by a data capture process (See Ehrling, Figure 8, element 1092, and

paragraph 0135, describing updating the user profile and behavior database and aggregate information database based on user input).

Ehring does not teach expressly associating, with the data elements, a set of data validation requirements for validating data captured in respect of each of the data elements.

Wolff teaches associating data validation requirements for validating data captured with the data elements (See Wolff, Figure 4, showing various checks on data completion, such as element 220 and 222, and Column 6, lines 28-38, describing an indication of an invalid data entry).

Ehring and Wolff are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic forms.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data validation of Wolff with the data capture process and functional specification of Ehring. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wolff with Ehring for the benefit of ensuring that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

**As per dependent claim 15**, Ehring and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Ehring also teaches that the data capture definition file conforms

to a standard that can be executed on a plurality of different platforms, such as by coding the data capture definition in XML (See Ehring, paragraph 0152).

**As per dependent claim 16**, Ehring and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Ehring also teaches that the data capture definition file is generated in XML format (See Ehring, paragraph 0152).

**As per dependent claim 17**, Ehring and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Ehring also teaches a means for incorporating, in the data capture definition file, a functional specification of data exchange requirements according to a form definition standard (See Ehring, paragraphs 0043 and 0061).

**As per dependent claim 18**, Ehring and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Ehring also teaches a means for enabling automatic building of portions of the data capture definition file according to a form definition standard (See Ehring, paragraph 0018).

**As per dependent claim 19**, Ehring and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Claim 19 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 9 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 9.

**As per dependent claim 20**, Ehring and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Claim 20 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 10 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 10.

**As per dependent claim 25**, Ehring and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Wolff also teaches a document validation model for ensuring compliance of a generated data capture definition file with at least one of a form definition standard, a function definition standard and a data model standard (See Wolff, Figure 4, and Column 6, lines 28-38). Ehring and Wolff are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic forms. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the document validation model of Wolff with the data capture process and functional specification of Ehring. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wolff with Ehring for the benefit of ensuring that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

**As per dependent claim 26**, Ehring and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Ehring also teaches that means for generating the data capture definition file further includes means for associating each data element with a respective section or sub-section in the logical hierarchical structure (See Ehring, paragraph 0130).

**As per dependent claim 27**, Ehring teaches the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Ehring does not teach expressly that the means for generating a succession of visual displays further comprises a means for inferring a relative physical positioning of user prompts for data element capture and a sequential progression of

user prompts for data element capture from the data capture definition file and a means for determining absolute physical positioning of user prompts and presentation styles thereof according to criteria defined in the means for executing the data capture process, and not the data capture definition file. Wolff teaches generating a succession of visual displays that include inferring a relative physical positioning of user prompts for data element capture and a means to determine the absolute physical position of the user prompts (See Wolff, Figure 4, showing various checks on data completion, such as element 220 and 222, and Column 6, lines 28-38, describing an indication of an invalid data entry). Ehrling and Wolff are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic forms. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the data validation specification and execution of data validation of Wolff with the data capture process and functional specification of Ehrling. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wolff with Ehrling for the benefit of ensuring that the user enters the correct data such that a reliable and expected data value will result and data errors may be avoided to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

**As per dependent claim 28**, Ehrling and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 27 as described above. Ehrling also teaches that the means for generating the data capture definition file and the means for generating a succession of visual displays operate on different computing platforms (See Ehrling, paragraph 0131).



**As per independent claim 31**, Ehrling teaches a method of generating a data capture definition file for defining data elements required from a user during a data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraph 0063, describing a dynamic composition engine including managers that organize components in an electronic page or form). Independent claim 31 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of independent claim 14 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 14.

**As per independent claim 33**, Ehrling teaches a computer program product, comprising a tangible computer readable medium having thereon computer program code adapted, when said computer program code is loaded onto a computer, to make the computer execute the procedure of any one of claims 30 to 32 (See Ehrling, Figure 2).

**As per independent claim 37**, Ehrling teaches an apparatus for generating a data capture definition file for defining data elements required from a user during a data capture process (See Ehrling, paragraph 0063, describing a dynamic composition engine including managers that organize components in an electronic page or form). Independent claim 37 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of independent claim 14 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 14.

5. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrling (U.S. Publication 2005/0097008 A1) in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent 5,774,887), as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Ravishankar (U.S. Patent 7,346,840).

**As per dependent claim 21**, Ehrling and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Ehrling and Wolff do not teach expressly means for assigning, to each data capture definition file, document ownership and execution rights. Ravishankar teaches assigning access and execution rights by means of incorporating subscriber attributes. Ehrling, Wolff and Ravishankar are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic forms. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the ownership and execution rights of Ravishankar with the data capture definition file of Ehrling and Wolff. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that the proper personnel are entering data, thus protecting any possible sensitive data or information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ravishankar with Ehrling and Wolff for the benefit of ensuring that the proper personnel are entering data, thus protecting any possible sensitive data or information, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

6. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrling (U.S. Publication 2005/0097008 A1) in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent 5,774,887), as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Hanson ("Saving Time With Global Templates"), hereafter referred to as "Hanson".

**As per dependent claim 22**, Ehrling and Wolff teach the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Ehrling and Wolff do not teach expressly the automatic copying of a global template. Hanson teaches using global templates, such as to generate code (See Hanson, Page 1). Ehrling, Wolff and Hanson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to generate the data capture definition file of Ehrling and Wolff using global templates as taught by Hanson. The motivation for doing so would have been to customize the style of the various data capture elements over multiple forms such that the forms maintain continuity. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hanson with Ehrling and Wolff for the benefit of customizing the style of the various data capture elements over multiple forms such that the forms maintain continuity to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

**As per dependent claim 23**, Ehrling, Wolff and Hanson teach the limitations of claim 22 as described above. While Ehrling, Wolff and Hanson do not teach expressly correlating changes made in global templates with relevant parts of data capture definition files that have been built using those templates, it was well known in the art that changes made to a global template would include changes made to components of

the said template, including any data elements included in the global template. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to correlate changes made in a global template with relevant parts of a data capture definition file, providing the benefit of maintaining continuity of the data elements across multiple forms.

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrling (U.S. Publication 2005/0097008 A1) in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent 5,774,887) and Hanson ("Saving Time With Global Templates"), hereafter referred to as "Hanson", as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of "Getting Started With Oracle Change Management Pack", hereafter referred to as "Oracle".

**As per dependent claim 24**, Ehrling, Wolff and Hanson teach the limitations of claim 23 as described above. Ehrling, Wolff and Hanson do not teach expressly means for generating an impact analysis report identifying potential consequences to relevant data capture definition files resulting from a proposed change to a template. Oracle teaches using Oracle Change Management Pack to generate a script and an impact report for data capture. Ehrling, Wolff, Hanson, and Oracle are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the impact report of Oracle with the data capture definition file of Ehrling, Wolff and Hanson. The motivation

for doing so would have been to determine whether the changes to the data definition are feasible, thus allowing the user to determine whether to proceed with the changes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Oracle with Ehrling, Wolff and Hanson for the benefit of determining whether the changes to the data definition are feasible, thus allowing the user to determine whether to proceed with the changes, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 and 36-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Laurie Ries/  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
17 November 2008

